



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

was that the Democratic Senators as a body played politics. With the exception of Senators Williams, of Mississippi; Rayner, of Maryland, and Thornton, of Louisiana, all of the Democrats voted to strike out paragraph three of article three, and also cast their votes for those provisions in the Bacon resolution of ratification which restricted the scope of the treaties.

The most disheartening feature of the action of the Senate was that it seemingly failed as a body to rise to any just appreciation of the momentous significance of these treaties in the progress of civilization, and that it failed to realize the staggering blow that it was dealing to the prestige of the United States as the recognized leader among the nations in the movement for the substitution of law for brute force in international relations. This was deeply realized by a number of Senators, among whom one must mention Root, Burton, John Sharp Williams, Rayner, McCumber, Crane, Cullom, and a few others who took no part in the debate, but the body as a whole seemed to have little vision or inspiration for the future.

As to what ought to be done with the treaties in their amended form, there are two very distinct views among the friends of arbitration. One view is that they have been rendered so weak and ineffective by the amendments that they ought to be allowed to perish. The distinguished men who hold this view declare that the resolution of ratification makes the treaties even more limited in scope than those negotiated in 1908 and now in force, and that the elimination of the rejected paragraph has cut out the very vitals of the pacts. The other view is that the treaties even in their amended form are a formal declaration in favor of the arbitration of all justiciable disputes, that the limitations placed upon them by the resolution of ratification are only such as our national policy would impose, and that we should still have practically all the value of the Commission of Inquiry, even though its decisions were only advisory. This view further holds the overwhelming vote of 76 to 3 in favor of ratification to be a very strong ground for putting the treaties into immediate effect. This view seems to us to mark out the course which should be taken, if the British and the French governments are inclined to accept the treaties as amended.

The President has not yet declared what course he will take, though there is reason for believing that he will make no effort to induce the British and French governments to accept the conventions in their present form, but will bring forward, as soon as possible, new treaties.



Dr. P. P. Claxton, National Commissioner of Education, has arranged for about thirty free lectures on the subject of peace to be given in thirty of the leading colleges of the South. Dr. Claxton has secured for these lectures the gratuitous services of Dr. Philip Van Ness Myers, of Cincinnati, the well known historian. A rich treat is in store for these colleges.

The Limitation of Naval and Military Expenditure.

We have received a copy of the Report of the Commission of the Interparliamentary Union on Limitation of Armaments (appointed by the Executive Council last year), which would have been presented at the Conference of the Union announced to meet at Rome in October last had not this Conference been put off on account of the cholera epidemic.

The Commission consisted of Baron d'Estournelles de Constant, of France; Conrad Haussman, of Germany; Paul Milyukov, of Russia, and Lord Weardale, of Great Britain. The report, which the bureau of the Union decided to publish, though the Conference at Rome failed, was written by Baron d'Estournelles de Constant, with the coöperation, of course, of the other members. It covers about forty pages octavo, and goes deeply into the present armed condition of the nations and the rivalry that goes on incessantly.

The report confesses frankly that the question "has not advanced one step" toward solution since the memorable London Conference of 1906, at which a powerful arraignment of the international rivalry of armaments was made by Senator d'Estournelles for a similar committee. The recommendations of the two Hague Conferences have been ignored by the governments, but the "force of inertia is neither a remedy nor an argument." It will be beaten down by "the leveling power of knowledge and information," and when "simple common sense" is once awakened it will become at once clear that "war is no longer a solution," and then it will be impossible for "each state to continue its race to ruin in order to prepare for war, which is condemned and detested by all." The Baron points out with great force the inconsistency between the professions of the governments and their action in continuing the rivalry in armaments.

The Commission proposes that the Union renew its protest of 1906; that the nations be asked, not to disarm separately, but to come to an agreement to reduce their forces simultaneously, on the ground that "a minimum of armaments gives more security, with less expense, than a maximum." Any nation that refused to enter the agreement would find the whole world against it and could not continue its opposition. The interests of the more powerful nations demand immediate reduction of their armaments. In ten years it will be too late. "Revolution will be begotten of armed peace."

Baron d'Estournelles inserts in the report a statement as to what has been attempted, or rather recommended toward the solution of the problem—the resolutions of the two Hague Conferences and the efforts of prominent statesmen in several parliaments. Nothing has come of these because no government, though all profess themselves to be ready to follow, has been found wise and brave enough to take the initiative.

The hundred years of peace between the United States and Great Britain, secured by disarmament on the Great Lakes, the report argues, proves that general limitation of armaments is entirely possible. This position is strengthened by the example of Chile and Argentina, and also by that of Mexico and the United States, whose border has always been unfortified.

Three pages of the report are devoted to the heavy

increase in armaments since 1898, the year of the publication of the Czar's famous rescript, and the perplexity, embarrassment, and increased peril in which the governments are becoming more and more involved through their policy of unreason.

The increase of armaments is not only ineffectual but it is also disastrous, inasmuch as it creates strikes and social convulsions. It lays crushing burdens on labor. Armaments are not an insurance; they create new dangers which prevent us from facing the real, the sufficiently serious dangers of our time.

The excessive armaments of the day are in direct contradiction to the progress of arbitration. This progress can no longer be laughed at, and public opinion will not much longer allow governments to play with fire. "The government that would spontaneously reduce its naval and military armaments within possible limits would be exposed to fewer dangers than the one which impoverishes the country by imposing excessive sacrifice upon it." What it lacked in battleships it would make up in the solidarity and enthusiasm of the people.

The great military powers are inferior in the economic struggles of the day, as shown by the extraordinary economic development of some of the non-militarized states like Denmark, Belgium, Holland, Sweden and Norway, Canada, etc. The indisputable fact is that "a powerful military state is today beaten on the markets of the world by feeble ones, incapable of protecting their commerce and colonies otherwise than by their faith in law and justice."

The report makes a strong plea that military and naval supplies ought not to be allowed to injure other national industries. Credits are refused every day for scientific research, for public works, agriculture, commerce, education, etc., because the national revenues are swallowed up by the exorbitant demands of the naval and military budgets. "What good would not the great civilizing nations have done to the world had they started with what they must necessarily come to sooner or later: had they employed in durable works the thousands of millions squandered, the millions of years of work wasted!"

A war of destruction, the report declares, is no longer possible. "The destruction of a civilized people nowadays is more an absurdity than a crime; armies or fleets may be crushed, but a nation cannot be stamped out." "To declare war on a country in the hope of crushing its commercial superiority is today a childish dream." "It is practically impossible today to threaten the property and commerce of the enemy without striking at the commerce of the whole world."

The report deals searchingly with the protection of colonies, maritime commerce, the empire of the sea, etc., as related to the question of armaments, and sweeps away the legends and delusions connected therewith.

So-called inevitable wars are not inevitable. The arguments used by the press of all nations to make the long-prophecied European war and a war between the United States and Japan seem absolutely certain are not worthy of attention, not one of them. These predicted wars are just as avoidable as many of those of history would have been if people had only had good sense.

The report points out that "the organization of peace is no longer a dream." Innumerable Congresses have

been held in the interests of the Commonwealth of Nations. The Universal Postal Union is a standing example of what is possible. The two Hague Conferences, incomplete as their results have been, have powerfully voiced the aspirations of the world. Some of their fruits, notably in the Dogger Bank incident, the Casablanca affair, and the North Atlantic fisheries controversy have been remarkable. The necessity of assuring peace is now felt not only by the people but by the governments themselves.

The interdependence of states is now such that the problem of armaments has become international, since the great and expensive establishments in each country, which exhaust its resources and compromise its vitality, are imposed by the example of its neighbors. "The determination of one becomes law for all."

The report urges upon the Interparliamentary Union the duty of securing the international study of the problem, and upon the separate governments, that of making a preliminary national examination of the question in each country, in order that some general agreement may be reached as a result of all these preliminary investigations.

"There is no reason to despair as to the solution of the problem of limitation of armaments. The only objection against it is its novelty. Ten years ago the possibility of an international arbitration court was laughed at, yet the court has been instituted and has given conclusive and decisive results, because the question was ever kept to the fore and because arbitration has ceased to be a dream and is now a practical and tangible patriotic care. This will be the case with the problem of limitation when, in the near future, it shall be studied as it should be, and not conceived as unpatriotic and impossible to solve."

The Commission asks the Interparliamentary Union at its next conference to urge its various groups to see that this problem is taken up without delay by the national parliaments, and also to urge that the question of limitation of armaments be put on the program of the next conference at The Hague.

Senator d'Estournelles is absolutely right in holding that the problem of armaments is one of the most pressing with which the governments are called upon to deal, and that consideration and action upon it cannot be delayed without enormous peril to all the highest interests of the world. The Interparliamentary Union, in its efforts to secure immediate consideration and solution of the problem, will have the united sympathy and support of the millions in all countries upon whom the colossal military and naval expenses of the day fall with such ruinous and exasperating effects.

The British Peace Council, 167 St. Stephen's House, Westminster, London, as well as many other peace organizations in Europe, has been doing everything in its power to induce the governments of Europe to attempt to persuade Italy and Turkey to come to speedy terms of peace; but so far the efforts of all these societies and of the governments themselves have been of no effect. The war still goes on. The latest report is of a severe battle and the defeat of the Italian troops, with the slaughter of 3,000 or more men. No immediate end of the unfortunate struggle seems to be in sight.